



**From:** [Trenton Terrace](#)  
**To:** [Columbia River Crossing](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** if you build it, they will come  
**Date:** Friday, June 20, 2008 9:25:49 AM  
**Attachments:**

**P-0730-001** | If we build a bigger bridge to handle more vehicles, we will get more vehicles crossing the bridge. We should build a bridge to handle mass transit and pedestrian/bicycle traffic only. Minimum environmental impact.  
**P-0730-002** |  
**P-0730-003** |

Terri Fay  
503-283-0966

### **P-0730-001**

As described in Chapter 3 (Section 3.4) of the DEIS and FEIS, and in the Indirect Effects Technical Report, highway capacity improvements and access improvements can induce development in suburban and rural areas that were not previously served, or were greatly underserved, by highway access. The DEIS outlines a comprehensive analysis of the potential induced growth effects that could be expected from the CRC project. A review of national research on induced growth indicates that there are six factors that tend to be associated with highway projects that induce sprawl. These are discussed in the Indirect Effects Technical Report. Based on the CRC project team's comparison of those national research findings to CRC's travel demand modeling, Metro's 2001 land use / transportation modeling, and a review of Clark County, City of Vancouver, City of Portland and Metro land use planning and growth management regulations, the DEIS and the FEIS conclude that the likelihood of substantial induced sprawl from the CRC project is very low. In fact, the CRC project, because of its location in an already urbanized area, the inclusion of new tolls that manage demand, the inclusion of new light rail, and the active regulation of growth management in the region, the CRC project will likely reinforce the region's goals of concentrating development in regional centers, reinforcing existing corridors, and promoting transit and pedestrian friendly development and development patterns.

In October, 2008, the project convened a panel of national experts to review the travel demand model methodology and conclusions, including a land use evaluation. The panel unanimously concluded that CRC's methods and the conclusions were valid and reasonable. Specifically, the panel noted that CRC would "have a low impact to induce growth...because the project is located in a mature urban area," and that it would "contribute to a better jobs housing balance in Clark County...a positive outcome of the project". These results are summarized in the "Columbia River Crossing Travel Demand Model Review

Report" (November 25, 2008).

In 2010, Metro ran the MetroScope model (an integrated land use and transportation model) to forecast growth associated with transportation improvements of a 12-lane river crossing and light rail to Clark College. Even with a 12-lane river crossing, the model showed only minimal changes in employment location and housing demand compared to the No-Build Alternative.

For a more detailed discussion regarding potential indirect land use changes as a result of the CRC project, including the likely land use changes associated with the introduction of light rail, please see Chapter 3 (Section 3.4) of the FEIS.

**P-0730-002**

A supplemental bridge that only includes improvements for transit and/or bicycles and pedestrians does not meet the CRC project's Purpose and Need. As described in Chapter 1 of the DEIS, the project's Purpose and Need "was developed by relying on previous planning studies, solicitation of public input, and coordination with stakeholder groups."

In addition to calling for improved bicycle, pedestrian and transit connectivity, the Purpose and Need also specifically states the need for improving highway freight mobility, travel safety and traffic operations, and the structural integrity of the existing bridges. These later needs would not be met by a supplemental bridge alternative that only provides for transit and/or bicycles and pedestrians.

**P-0730-003**

The DEIS discussed the potential impacts of the project alternatives on the natural environment, including fish and other aquatic and terrestrial species (Section 3.14 of the DEIS and the Ecosystems Technical Reports). Impacts to fish, wildlife, and habitat as a result of constructing

the CRC project were similar among all alternatives analyzed in the DEIS. The DEIS analysis of potential impacts to threatened and endangered species was coordinated with the federal agencies that implement the Endangered Species Act – the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The analysis was also coordinated with the Washington and Oregon state departments of fish and wildlife. The ESA, as well as NMFS and USFWS, do not require the completion of a Biological Assessment prior to a DEIS. The information available in the DEIS and related technical reports aided the project's local partner agencies in selecting a LPA.

Since the publication of the DEIS, a Biological Assessment was prepared and submitted that provided more detailed impact analysis for compliance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. It addressed hydroacoustic impacts and stormwater treatment and other potential impacts to species listed under the Endangered Species Act. Based upon the evaluation of this Assessment, NMFS and USFWS issued a Biological Opinion that the project will not likely jeopardize the continued existence or adversely modify the habitat of a listed threatened or endangered species. See Chapter 3 (Section 3.16) of the FEIS for more discussion on ecosystem impact analysis and mitigation.